

REMARKS

Claims 8, 10-12, 20-25 and 27-30 are pending. In an Official Action dated October 17, 2007, claims 8, 10-12, 20-25 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 8, 10-12, 20-25 and 27-30 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The rejections are addressed in turn below.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for a telephonic interview on January 15, 2008. At the interview, proposed amendments to the claims were discussed by the Examiner and the undersigned, without reaching any specific agreement.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 8, 10-12, 20-25 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. As for claim 8, the claim is amended to clearly recite a processor and computer readable storage medium having program code that causes said processor to perform a plurality of operations. Claim 8 and its dependent claims are therefore squarely within the statutory subject matter requirements of section 101. Applicants note that the “storing a validated XML instance in a database column” element is not conditional, so cannot just “hang up there” without producing a tangible result as suggested in the Official Action.

As for claim 20 and its dependents, Applicants have removed the conditional language from the preamble of claim 20 as suggested in the Official Action. The claims produce a clear tangible result as discussed with reference to claim 8 by “storing said XML instance in said column.”

As for claim 25 and its dependents, the claim is amended to recite a “storage” medium, and the other concerns expressed in the Official Action are addressed as described above.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8, 10-12, 20-25 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Murthy et al. (U.S. Publication No. 7,096,224). Applicants point out at least one limitation that defines over Murthy, e.g.:

typing said database column with said container, and subsequently preventing the container from being removed from said database system unless said typing said database column is reversed, and wherein said typing comprises validating any XML instances existing in said database column prior to said typing.

As recited in claim 8. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of this limitation that defines over Murthy.

The Official Action page 10 quotes various excerpts from Murthy that allegedly disclose “typing said database column with said container.” Applicants point out, however, none of the excerpts teach or suggest typing a database column with a container as recited in Applicants’ independent claims. As explained in Applicants’ response of March 6, 2007, Murthy is directed to storing XML documents in a database by mapping various parts of the XML document to the structure of the database. *See, e.g.,* “Functional Overview” in col. 3, lines 25-62. In contrast, Applicants’ claims generally define a system, method, and computer readable medium whereby a column in a database can be “typed” with a container for schema namespaces, allowing validation and storage in the column of instances conforming to all namespaces in the container.

Specifically, Murthy does not disclose typing database columns with a container for XML schema namespaces, as required by each of the independent claims. E.g., claim 8 requires, *inter alia*, “program code executable by said processor for typing said database column with said container.” Claim 20 requires, *inter alia*, “typing a column of a relational database with said container.” Claim 25 requires, *inter alia*, “computer readable instructions for typing said database column with said container.”

Murthy col. 9, lines 35-67 disclose “[b]y default, schema-based XMLType is stored in an underlying (hidden) object type column.” However, *this amounts to at most typing a column with a bare XML schema, not a container for schemas* as recited in the claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2793 / 304866.01
Application No.: 10/726,080
Office Action Dated: October 17, 2007

PATENT

While Applicants maintain that “typing said database column with said container” is not disclosed in Murthy, the limitation is nonetheless amended as provided above to expedite allowance. It will be appreciated that Murthy discloses neither “preventing the container from being removed from said database system unless said typing said database column is reversed,” nor “wherein said typing comprises validating any XML instances existing in said database column prior to said typing.”

For these reasons, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Date: January 15, 2008

/Nathaniel Gilder/
Nathaniel Gilder
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439